

197/01184 A02

REMARKS

The application comprises claims 1-38, 40-44, and 46-58 of which claims 1, 8, 9, 24, 46, and 48 are independent claims. Claims 1, 8, 9, 24, 40, 43, 44, 46, and 58 have been amended. Claims 39 and 45 have been canceled. This response refers primarily to the independent claims. The patentability of the dependent claims follow at least for the reason of being dependent on an independent claim that is patentable.

Applicants thank the Examiner for the telephonic interview. In the interest of expediting the issuance of a patent, applicants have amended the claims to be in condition for allowance. The amendments are according to the indications of the Examiner and should therefore be acceptable in response to the Final Office Action.

In the Office Action, the Examiner states that claims 8, 9, 24, and 45-47 contain allowable subject matter. Applicants have amended claim 1 to include the limitations of claim 45. Claims 8, 9, 24, and 46 were amended to independent form.

Claims 39 and 45 were cancelled since they are now included in the amended claim 1. Claims 40, 43, and 44 were amended to depend directly on amended claim 1 instead of claim 39, which was cancelled.

Claims 2-7, 10-23, 25-38, 40-44, 57 and 58 are dependent on amended claim 1 with the limitations of previous claim 45. Claim 47 is dependent on claim 46, which was indicated as allowable by the Examiner.

Claims 1-47, and 57-58 are now all in condition for allowance as indicated by the Examiner.

Applicants point out that claim 58 has been amended by deleted an extra period at the end of the claim.

Regarding claims 48-56, applicants request the Examiner to reconsider their rejection since independent claim 48 comprises a limitation which is not included in claim 1 and not shown by the art presented by the Examiner.

Independent claim 48 has the limitation "determining at least one WWW page that includes links to at least one URL of said list of URLs but not to said provided at least one URL". This limitation is not included in claim 1, in contrast to what was stated by the Examiner in paragraph 29.

Additionally, Ryan does not disclose determining a WWW page that contains certain "keywords" (links to at least one URL of said list of URLs) but lacks a specific "keyword" (said

197/01184 A02

provided at least one URL). In paragraph 63 the Examiner references Table 7 in Ryan (col. 15 lines 39-48) to show the above limitation. Applicants would like to point out that this table is used by Ryan to prevent a user from influencing a popular hit list by repetitively searching for the same keyword (see also col. 26 lines 20-31). The results of the search are not affected in any way by the IP address of the user that is stored in this table (see col. 26 lines 23-25). In contrast the limitation in claim 48 requires a limitation that affects the results of the search.

If however the Examiner is not convinced that claims 48-56 are in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to cancel these claims in an Examiner's amendment.

In view of the above remarks and amendment, applicants respectfully await an allowance.

Respectfully submitted,
Moshe KOPPEL et al.

for Paul Fenster ^{Reg #} 33,877
Maier Fenster
Reg. No. 41,016

October 25, 2004
Roy N. Envall, Jr.
c/o Anthony Castorina
2001 Jefferson Davis Highway, Suite 207
Arlington, VA 22202

Tel: (703) 415-1581